

THE KAPLANSKY CONDITION AND RINGS OF ALMOST STABLE RANGE 1

MOSHE ROITMAN
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF HAIFA
MOUNT CARMEL, HAIFA 31905, ISRAEL

ABSTRACT. We present some variants of the Kaplansky condition for a K-Hermite ring R to be an elementary divisor ring; for example, a commutative K-Hermite ring R is an EDR iff for any elements $x, y, z \in R$ such that $(x, y) = (1)$, there exists an element $\lambda \in R$ such that $x + \lambda y = uv$, where $(u, z) = (v, 1 - z) = (1)$.

We present an example of a Bézout domain that is an elementary divisor ring, but it does not have almost stable range 1, thus answering a question of Warren Wm. McGovern.

1. INTRODUCTION

First we recall some basic definitions and known results.

All rings here are commutative with unity. A ring R is *Bézout* if each finitely generated ideal of R is principal.

Two rectangular matrices A and B in $M_{m,n}(R)$ are *equivalent* if there exist invertible matrices $P \in M_{m,m}(R)$ and $Q \in M_{n,n}(R)$ such that $B = PAQ$.

The ring R is *K-Hermite* if every rectangular matrix A over R is equivalent to an upper or a lower triangular matrix (following [9, Appendix to §4] we use the term ‘K-Hermite’ rather than ‘Hermite’ as in [8]). From [8] it follows that this definition is equivalent to the definition given there. See also [6, Theorem 3]: by this theorem, a ring is K-Hermite iff for every two comaximal elements $a, b \in R$, there are two comaximal elements $a_1, b_1 \in R$ such that $(a, b) = (a_1 a + b_1 b)$ in R . Parentheses $()$ are used to denote the ideal generated by the specified elements.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13F99.

Key words and phrases. almost stable range 1, elementary divisor ring, Kaplansky condition, K-Hermite, stable range.

Part of this work was done while visiting the New Mexico State University. I thank Bruce Olberding from this university for useful discussions and suggestions concerning this topic.

A ring R is an *elementary divisor ring* (*EDR*) iff every rectangular matrix A over R is equivalent to a diagonal matrix. It follows from [8] that this definition is equivalent to the definition given there.

An EDR is K-Hermite and a K-Hermite ring is Bézout. An integral domain is Bézout iff it is K-Hermite.

By [5, Theorem 6] a ring R is an EDR iff it satisfies the following two conditions:

- (1) R is K-Hermite;
- (2) R satisfies Kaplansky's condition (see §2, condition (K) below).

By [4, Example 4.11], (1) $\not\Rightarrow$ (2). The question in [6] whether a Bézout domain is an EDR (equivalently, whether it satisfies Kaplansky's condition), is still open. On the other hand, it is immediate that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) (Remark 1 below).

In section 2, we elaborate on the Kaplansky condition.

A row $[r_1, \dots, r_n]$ over a ring R is *unimodular* if the elements $r_1, \dots, r_n$ generate the ideal R . The *stable range* $\text{sr}(R)$ of a ring R is the least integer $n \geq 1$ (if it exists) such that for any unimodular row $[r_1, \dots, r_{n+1}]$ over R , there exist $t_1, \dots, t_n \in R$ such that the row

$$[r_1 + t_1 r_{n+1}, \dots, r_n + t_n r_{n+1}]$$

is unimodular (see comments on [9, Theorem 5.2, Ch. VIII]). For background on stable range see [1, §3, Ch. V].

The ring R has *almost stable range* 1 if every proper homomorphic image of R has stable range 1 (see [10]). By [10, Theorem 3.7] a Bézout ring with almost stable range 1 is an EDR. We elaborate on the almost stable range 1 condition in §3. In particular, we present an elementary divisor domain (so Bézout) that does not have almost stable range 1, thus answering the question of Warren Wm. McGovern in [10] (Example 13). By Remark 12 below, a ring of stable range 1 is of almost stable range 1. On the other hand, $\mathbb{Z}$ is of almost stable range 1, but is not of stable range 1 (the stable range of $\mathbb{Z}$ is 2. More generally, the stable range of any K-Hermite ring is ≤ 2 [11, Proposition 8]. Also by [12, Theorem 1], a Bézout ring is K-Hermite iff it is of stable range ≤ 2).

For general background see [8], [3, §6, Ch. 3] and [10].

2. ON THE KAPLANSKY CONDITION

By [5] a K-Hermite ring R is an elementary divisor ring iff it satisfies Kaplansky's condition (see [8, Theorem 5.2]):

(K) *For any three elements a, b, c in R that generate the ideal R , there exist elements $p, q \in R$ so that $(pa, pb + qc) = (1)$ in R .*

Remark 1. *If R is a ring of stable range 1, then R satisfies Kaplansky's condition with $p = 1$. Thus, if R is a ring satisfying Kaplansky's condition, then R is not necessarily K-Hermite, even if R is a Noetherian local domain.*

Indeed, a local ring R is of stable range 1. If R is also a Noetherian domain, then R is K-Hermite iff R is a principal ideal ring. Hence a Noetherian local domain that is not a principal ideal ring is of stable range 1, but it does not satisfy Kaplansky's condition. $\square$

In the proof of Lemma 3 below, we will use the following well-known fact:

Remark 2. *Let R be a ring, let A be a matrix in $M_{m,n}(R)$, let $\mathbf{r}$ be a row in $M_{1,n}(R)$, and let $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then $\mathbf{r}$ belongs to the submodule of R^n generated by the rows of the matrix A iff there exists a matrix $C \in M_{k,m}(R)$ such that $\mathbf{r}$ is the first row of the matrix CA .*

Lemma 3. *Let A be a 2×2 -matrix over a ring R , and let $\mathbf{u}$ be a unimodular row of length 2 over R .*

Then

$\mathbf{u}$ belongs to the submodule of R^2 generated by the rows of $A \iff$ there exists an invertible matrix P so that $\mathbf{u}$ is the first row of PA .

Proof.

$\implies :$

By Remark 2, there exists a 2-row $\mathbf{r}$ over R so that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{r}A$. Since the row $\mathbf{u}$ is unimodular, the row $\mathbf{r}$ is also unimodular. Since $\mathbf{r}$ is unimodular of length 2, there exists an invertible matrix P with first row equal to $\mathbf{r}$. Thus $\mathbf{u}$ is the first row of the matrix PA .

$\impliedby :$

This follows from Remark 2. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let A be a 2×2 matrix over a ring R so that its entries generate the ideal R . Then*

A is equivalent to a diagonal matrix $\iff$ the submodule of R^2 generated by the rows of A contains a unimodular row.

In this case A is equivalent to a matrix of the form $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof.

$\Rightarrow$

By assumption A is equivalent to a diagonal matrix $D = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$, where $d_1, d_2 \in R$. Thus d_1, d_2 generate the ideal R . The sum of the rows of D , namely, $[d_1, d_2]$, is unimodular.

$\Leftarrow$

By Lemma 3, the matrix A is equivalent over R to a matrix B with first row unimodular. Hence the submodule generated by the columns of B contains a column of the form $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ * \end{pmatrix}$. By Lemma 3 again (for columns), we obtain that A is equivalent to a matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & r \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$. By subtracting the first column of the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & r \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$ multiplied by r from its second column and by a similar elementary row transformation, we obtain a diagonal matrix of the form $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}$. $\square$

Theorem 5. (see [8, Theorem 5.2] and [5, Corollary 5].)

Let R be a ring. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ a triangular 2×2 -matrix over R so that $(a, b, c) = (1)$. Then A is equivalent to a diagonal matrix over R iff there exist elements p, q in R so $(pa, pb + qc) = (1)$.

Proof. Since $p[a, b] + q[0, c] = [pa, pb + qc]$ for any elements $p, q \in R$, the theorem follows from Lemma 4. $\square$

Remark 6. Let R be any ring. If Kaplansky's condition $(pb + qc, pa) = (1)$ holds for elements $a, b, c, p, q \in R$, then

$$(pb + qc, a) = (p, c) = (1).$$

Indeed, Kaplansky's condition implies that

$$(pb + qc, a) = (pb + qc, p) = (1),$$

so $(p, c) = (1)$. Cf. the next proposition. $\square$

Proposition 7. Let R be a K -Hermite ring, and let a, b and c be elements of R that generate the ideal R . Then the following four conditions are equivalent:

- (1) The matrix $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ is equivalent to a diagonal matrix;
- (2) There exist elements p, q in R so $(pa, pb + qc) = (1)$;
- (3) There exist elements p and q in R so that $(pb + qc, a) = (p, c) = (1)$;
- (4) For some elements $\lambda, u, v \in R$ we have $b + \lambda c = uv$, and $(u, a) = (v, c) = (1)$.

Moreover, in (4) we may choose the elements u and v such that $(u, v) = (1)$.

Proof.

(1) $\iff$ (2):

This follows from Theorem 5.

(2) $\implies$ (4):

Since $(pa, pb + qc) = (1)$ we obtain $(1) = (p, pb + qc) = (p, qc)$, so $(p, (pb + qc)c) = (1)$. Let v be an element of R so that

$$vp \equiv 1 \pmod{(pb + qc)c},$$

thus $vp \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$. We have $v(pb + qc) \equiv b \pmod{c}$, so $v(pb + qc) = b + \lambda c$ for some element $\lambda \in R$. Hence $b + \lambda c = uv$, where $u = pb + qc$, thus $(u, a) = (v, c) = (u, v) = (1)$.

(4) $\implies$ (3):

We have $b \equiv uv \pmod{c}$. Let $p \in R$ so that $pv \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$. Hence $pb \equiv u \pmod{c}$, so there exists an element $q \in R$ such that $pb + qc = u$. Thus (3) holds.

(3) $\implies$ (2):

Since R is a K-Hermite ring, we may write $(d) = (p, q)$ and $d = p_1p + q_1q$ with $(p_1, q_1) = (1)$. Hence

$$(p_1, p_1b + q_1c) = (p_1, q_1c) = (1),$$

so $(p_1a, p_1b + q_1c) = (p_1, c) = (1)$. Condition (2) holds with p and q replaced by p_1 and q_1 , respectively. $\square$

In the proof of Proposition 7, we have used the assumption that R is K-Hermite just for the implication (3) $\implies$ (2).

Remark 8. *If R is a Bézout domain, then the following condition is equivalent to the conditions of Proposition 7:*

(*) *For some elements $\lambda, a_1, c_1 \in R$ we have*

$$b + \lambda c \mid (1 - a_1a)(1 - c_1c).$$

Indeed, assume condition (*). Let $u \in R$ so that

$$(u) = (b + \lambda c, 1 - a_1a),$$

thus $(u, a) = (1)$ and $\frac{b + \lambda c}{u} \mid \left(\frac{1 - a_1a}{u}\right)(1 - c_1c)$. Since $\left(\frac{b + \lambda c}{u}, \frac{1 - a_1a}{u}\right) = (1)$, we see that $v := \frac{b + \lambda c}{u}$ divides $1 - c_1c$, so $(v, c) = (1)$. Thus condition (*) implies condition (4) of Proposition 7. The converse implication is obvious. $\square$

Since a K-Hermite ring is an EDR iff each matrix of the form $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ with $(a, b, c) = (1)$ has a diagonal reduction [8], Proposition 7 provides necessary and sufficient conditions for a K-Hermite ring to be an EDR. We present an additional condition in the next proposition.

Theorem 9. *Let R be a K -Hermite ring. The following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *R is an elementary divisor ring;*
- (2) *For any elements $x, y, z \in R$ such that $(x, y) = (1)$, there exists an element $\lambda \in R$ such that $x + \lambda y = uv$, where $(u, z) = (v, 1 - z) = (1)$.*

Moreover, the elements u and v can be chosen such that $(u, v) = (1)$.

Proof.

(1) $\implies$ (2) [including the requirement that $(u, v) = (1)$]:

We apply condition (4) of Proposition 7 to the elements $a = z, b = x, c = y(1 - z)$.

(2) $\implies$ (1):

We verify condition (4) of Proposition 7. Let $(a, b, c) = (1)$. Let $(d) = (b, c)$, thus $(d, a) = (b, c, a) = (1)$. Hence $a \mid 1 - d_1 d$ for some element $d_1 \in R$. Also $b = b_1 d, c = c_1 d$, where $(b_1, c_1) = (1)$. We apply condition (2) of the present proposition to the elements

$$x = b_1, y = c_1, z = d_1 d.$$

Thus there are elements $\lambda_1, u_1, v \in R$ so that $b_1 + \lambda_1 c_1 = u_1 v$, where $(u_1, 1 - d_1 d) = (v, d_1 d) = (1)$. Let $u = du_1$, thus $(u, a) = 1$. Let $\lambda = \lambda_1 d$. Hence $b + \lambda c = d(b_1 + \lambda_1 c_1) = uv$, and $(u, a) = (1)$. We have $(v, c) = (v, dc_1) = (v, c_1)$ since $(v, d) = (1)$. Since v divides $b_1 + \lambda_1 c_1$, it follows that $(v, c_1) \mid b_1$, so $(v, c_1) = (1)$. Thus $(v, c) = (1)$, as required. $\square$

Proposition 10. *Let R be a Bézout domain. The following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *R is an elementary divisor ring;*
- (2) *For any nonzero elements $x, y, z \in R$, there exists elements $\lambda, a, b \in R$ such that $x + \lambda y \mid y(1 - az)(1 - b(1 - z))$ in R .*

Proof. (1) $\implies$ (2):

Let $(d) = (x, y)$, thus $\frac{x}{d}$ and $\frac{y}{d}$ are comaximal. By Theorem 9, there are elements $\lambda, a, b \in R$ so that $(\frac{x}{d} + \lambda \frac{y}{d}) \mid (1 - az)(1 - bz(1 - z))$. Hence $x + \lambda y \mid d(1 - az)(1 - b(1 - z))$, so $x + \lambda y \mid y(1 - az)(1 - b(1 - z))$.

(2) $\implies$ (1):

Let x_0 and y_0 be comaximal elements in R , and let $z \in R$. Thus $(x_0 + \lambda y_0) \mid y_0(1 - az)(1 - b(1 - z))$ for some elements $\lambda, a, b \in R$. Since the elements $x_0 + \lambda y_0$ and y_0 are comaximal, we obtain that $(x_0 + \lambda y_0) \mid (1 - az)(1 - b(1 - z))$, so R is an EDR by Remark 8. $\square$

3. ON RINGS OF ALMOST STABLE RANGE 1

Proposition 11. *Let R be any ring. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) R is of almost stable range 1;
- (2) For each nonzero element $z \in R$, the ring R/zR is of stable range 1;
- (3) For each three elements $x, y, z \in R$ so that $(x, y) = (1)$ and $z \neq 0$, there exists an element $\lambda \in R$ so that $(x + \lambda y, z) = (1)$.

Proof. Cf. [1, Proposition 3.2, Ch. V].

(1) $\implies$ (2) $\implies$ (3): Clear.

(3) $\implies$ (1):

Let I be a nonzero ideal of R and let z be a nonzero element in I . Let $x + I, y + I$ be two comaximal elements in R/I . Hence there exist elements $r, s \in R$ such that $1 - rx - sy \in I$. By assumption, there exists an element $\lambda \in R$ such that $(x + \lambda(1 - rx), z)R = R$. Thus $x + \lambda sy$ is invertible modulo the ideal I . It follows that R/I is of stable range 1, so R is almost of stable range 1. $\square$

Remark 12. *The implication (3) $\implies$ (1) in the previous proposition is clear since if T is a homomorphic image of a ring R with finite stable range, then $\text{sr}(T) \leq \text{sr}(R)$ [1, Proposition 3.2, Ch. V], although this fact was not used explicitly, but rather its proof (in the above proof of the implication (2) $\implies$ (3) we have $\text{sr}(R/I) \leq \text{sr}(R/(z)) = 1$). This fact implies that if R is an arbitrary ring of stable range 1, then R is of almost stable range 1, thus answering the question in [10, Remark 3.3]. See also [10, Proposition 3.2].*

As we have seen in §2, the stable range 1 property implies Kaplansky's condition for an arbitrary ring. As for the converse, even if R is an elementary divisor domain, thus R satisfies Kaplansky's condition, then R does not necessarily has even almost stable range 1:

Example 13. *An elementary divisor domain (and so Bézout) that does not have almost stable range 1 (this example answers the question in [10, Remark 4.7]).*

We use a well-known example of a Bézout domain, namely, $R = \mathbb{Z} + X\mathbb{Q}[X]$ (for a general theorem on pullbacks of Bézout domains see [7, Theorem 1.9]). R is an elementary divisor ring by [2, Theorem 4.61]. However, $R/X\mathbb{Q}[X]$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\text{sr } \mathbb{Z} = 2$ (clearly, there is no integer m such that $2 + 5m = \pm 1$. Thus $\text{sr } \mathbb{Z} > 1$. As mentioned in the introduction, the stable range of any Bézout domain is ≤ 2 , hence $\text{sr } \mathbb{Z} = 2$). $\square$

We conjecture that a Bézout domain that is a pullback of type $\square$ (as defined in [7]) of elementary divisor domains is again an EDR. In this case the conditions of [7, Theorem 1.9] must be satisfied. If this conjecture proves to be false, this will yield a negative answer to the question in [6] whether a Bézout domain is an EDR.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hyman Bass, *Algebraic K-theory*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1968. MR0249491 (40 #2736)
- [2] Douglas Costa, Joe L. Mott, and Muhammad Zafrullah, *The construction $D + XD_s[X]$* , J. Algebra **53** (1978), no. 2, 423–439. MR0506224 (58 #22046)
- [3] László Fuchs and Luigi Salce, *Modules over non-Noetherian domains*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 84, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. MR1794715 (2001i:13002)
- [4] Leonard Gillman and Melvin Henriksen, *Rings of continuous functions in which every finitely generated ideal is principal*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **82** (1956), 366–391. MR0078980 (18,9d)
- [5] ———, *Some remarks about elementary divisor rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **82** (1956), 362–365. MR0078979 (18,9c)
- [6] Melvin Henriksen, *Some remarks on elementary divisor rings. II*, Michigan Math. J. **3** (1955), 159–163. MR0092772 (19,1155i)
- [7] Evan Houston and John Taylor, *Arithmetic properties in pullbacks*, J. Algebra **310** (2007), no. 1, 235–260. MR2307792 (2008b:13028)
- [8] Irving Kaplansky, *Elementary divisors and modules*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **66** (1949), 464–491. MR0031470 (11,155b)
- [9] T. Y. Lam, *Serre’s problem on projective modules*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. MR2235330 (2007b:13014)
- [10] Warren Wm. McGovern, *Bézout rings with almost stable range 1*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **212** (2008), no. 2, 340–348. MR2357336 (2008h:13033)
- [11] Pere Menal and Jaume Moncasi, *On regular rings with stable range 2*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **24** (1982), no. 1, 25–40. MR647578 (83g:16025)
- [12] B. V. Zabavskii, *Reduction of matrices over Bezout rings of stable rank at most 2*, Ukraïn. Mat. Zh. **55** (2003), no. 4, 550–554. MR2072558